

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/910,862	07/24/2001	Tomoaki Kawada	HITA.0090	4055
7590 10/05/2004			EXAMINER	
Stanley P. Fisher			LESPERANCE, JEAN E	
Reed Smith Hazel & Thomas LLP Suite 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3110 Fairview Park Drive			2674	
Falls Church, VA 22042-4503			DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/910,862	KAWADA ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jean E Lesperance	2674				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three managements.	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 is on and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in						
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
	Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:		Hony N. Jon				
		HENRY N.TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: The newly added dependent claims 24-26 claim "the light guide plate is transparent" is a new limitation and is considered as new issue.

The applicant argued that none of the references cited teaches or suggests a plurality of grooves which are formed at the corner portion and examiner disagrees with the applicant's statement. See the last office action on page 3 which reads "a plurality of grooves and located opposite the front surface, and a sidesurface transverse to the front and rear surfaces (column 9, lines 57-59) and as can be seen in Figure 6, where the lamp 13 occupied the entire rear surfaces which means also that the light emission or the lamp 31 is placed at the corner of the light guide plate and creates a plurality of grooves which the examiner is interpreted as corresponding to a light emission pattern having a plurality of grooves slanted to the one side of the light guide plate". The applicant argued that Kayoko's plurality of light diffusion members are formed at the corners of the front and side surfaces of the light guide plate, rather than the back surface. Examiner disagrees with the applicant because it is obvious that the light guide plate from the side surface is reflected on the back surface as well. The applicant argued that the prior art doers not teach a plurality of grooves overlap with the display area. Examiner disagrees and advised the applicant to read Figure 6 of Yuuki et al. where the light guide plate member 31 and the reflecting members 50g-50r overlapped each other. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.